



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/955,614

09/18/2001

Kevin M. Ferguson

7055 US

1133

30078

7590

09/03/2004

TEKTRONIX, INC.

14150 S.W. KARL BRAUN DRIVE

P.O. BOX 500 (50-LAW)

BEAVERTON, OR 97077-0001

EXAMINER

DESIRE, GREGORY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/955,614	Applicant(s) FERGUSON, KEVIN M.	
	Examiner Gregory M. Desire	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/31/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: It appears the providing step in line 1, from the disclosure and claims should be the processing step. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lubin (5,974,159).

Regarding claim 1 Lubin discloses,

An improved method of real time human vision system behavior modeling of the type having spatial modeling (note col. 2 lines 5-8 and 10-14, lines cite visual discriminator examiner interprets as human vision system behavior modeling comprising spatial discriminator (spatial modeling) which can be performed in real time) to obtain a measure of visible impairment of a test image signal derived from a reference image (note col. 2 lines 3-5 and col. 3 lines 57-62), examiner interprets accessing the visibility difference between two inputs which are reference and test

signals, examiner interprets as obtaining a visible impairment of a test image from a reference image)

Comprising the step of temporally processing (note fig. 2, temporal filtering, examiner interprets as temporally processing) the reference (fig. 2 block 210 input sequence A in connection with col. 3 lines 59-60, examiner interprets input sequence A as reference image) and test image signals (note fig. 2 block 212 input sequence B in connection with col. 3 lines 61-62, examiner interprets input signal B as test image signal) prior to the spatial modeling to account for temporal responses (note fig. 2 block 240 in connection with col. 4 lines 4-14, processing of temporal filters is performed prior to spatial discriminator examiner interprets as spatial modeling to account for temporal response).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin et al (5,974,159) in view of Brill et al (5,719,966).

Regarding claim 2 Lubin discloses,

Linear temporal filtering the reference and test image signals to produce reference and test low pass filter outputs (note col. 4 lines 12-14 col. 8 lines 40-45, examiner interprets combining low pass and band pass filters as linear temporal filtering)

Lubin discloses multiple low pass filters. However, Lubin is silent disclosing non-linear filtering of the low pass filter output. Brill discloses non-linear filtering by applying non-linear function lookup table to low pass and band pass filters normalizing output generating contrasts (note col.13 lines 40-46). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply a non-linear function to temporal filter in the system of Lubin. Generating contrast would have been a desirable feature in the human visual system when measuring the visibility of differences between two images and Brill recognizes generating contrasts would be expected when non-linear function of Brill is included in Lubin.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (703) 308-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) Second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.D.
August 31, 2004

Gregory M. Desire
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gregory M. Desire".